

**FINANCE DEPARTMENT**  
**DIRECTORATE OF LOTTERIES, CHANDIGARH**

The 28th November, 1981

No. DDL/SCJ/81/9055-A. The 82nd Draw of Haryana Janta Lottery, held at Chandigarh on 28th November, 1981, was conducted in the presence of the following Judges :

1. Mrs. A. Kulwant Singh,  
w/o Mr. Kulwant Singh.  
Kothi No. 502/16,  
Chandigarh.
2. Mrs. Saroj Aditya,  
w/o Dr. P.K. Aditya.  
Kothi No. 26/19-A,  
Chandigarh.
3. Mrs. Brijesh Mathur,  
w/o B.C. Mathur,  
Officers Bungalow,  
Kothi No. 6/19-A,  
Chandigarh.
4. Mr. Virender Kumar,  
1291/21-B,  
Chandigarh.
5. Mrs. Veena Sodhi,  
w/o Col. S. S. Sodhi,  
118/10-A,  
Chandigarh.

**GIAN CHAND, I. A. S.,**

Director of Lotteries and Joint  
Secretary to Government, Haryana,  
Finance Department, Chandigarh.

**REGULATIONS**

The 19th November, 1981

No. 3/1(3)-81-2FRII. In exercise of powers conferred by clause (2) of article 283 of the Constitution of India and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Punjab Subsidiary Treasury Rules, Volume I, in their application to the State of Haryana, namely : -

1. These rules may be called the Punjab Subsidiary Treasury Volume I (Haryana Third Amendment) Rules, 1981.
2. These rules shall come into force with effect from 1st April, 1977.
3. In the Punjab Subsidiary Treasury Rules, Volume I (hereinafter called the said rules), for rule 4.42, the following rule shall be substituted, namely :-

“4.42. In the Public Works Division, travelling allowance bill can be submitted in duplicate only after the claims have been passed by the Controlling Officer. The subordinates should prepare their travelling allowance journals in form S.T.R. 28 and after these are duly countersigned by the proper authority, the initial check and scrutiny may be got done by correspondence branch of the division. After initial check, the journal alongwith travelling allowance bill should be submitted to the accounts branch which after applying necessary treasury checks will record the ‘pay order’ as is done in the case of pay bills, arrear bills, etc. Payment will therefore be drawn from the Treasury by cheques.”

4. In the said rules, for rule 4.81 and note thereunder, the following rule shall be substituted, namely :—

“4.81. Funds may be provided to officers of the Public Works Department in the following two ways, namely :—

(a) in direction and other special offices, directly on pay, travelling allowance and contingent bills, presented by the Head of Offices. The relevant provisions of withdrawals of the bills shall apply to these bills as they apply to bills of other Civil Department ; and

(b) by means of cheques in all other cases”.

5. In the said rules, rules 4.82, 4.83 and 4.84 shall be deleted.

T. K. BANERJI,

Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana,  
Finance Department.

### LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 20th October, 1981

No. 9(1)81-6Lab/12042. In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Market Committee, Julana, District Jind.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK,

Reference No. 54 of 1981

*between*

SHRI MAHABIR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MARKET COMMITTEE,  
JULANA, DISTRICT JIND

*Present* :—

Shri Mahabir, workman in person.

No one for the management.

### AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor *vide* his order No. ID/KNL/139-80/11235, dated 11th March, 1981 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Mahabir, workman and the management of M/s Market Committee, Julana. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mahabir was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices as usual were sent to the parties. The workman appeared in response to the same on 10th April, 1981 but no one appeared on behalf of the management. Another notice was issued to the management for 18th May, 1981 but neither the parties appeared. The parties were issued fresh notice for 13th July, 1981 and when the management did not appear despite the service of notice to them *ex parte* proceedings was taken up against the management. *Ex parte* evidence of the workman was recorded on 4th August, 1981. The workman examined himself as his witness and he stated that he was appointed on regular basis on 31st March, 1980, *vide* appointment letter Ex. W-1/1 and his services were terminated on 1st August, 1980, *vide* Ex. WW-1/2. He was re-employed by the management on 29th January, 1981. The workman has prayed that he be granted wages for the intervening period at the rate of Rs. 250 per month as the management terminated his services without serving him with any notice or charge-sheet nor any notice pay or compensation was paid to him.

From the appointment letter Ex. WW-1/1 it is clear that the workman was appointed on 31st March, 1980 on purely temporary basis and his services liable to be terminated at any time without any notice. According to Ex. WW-1/2 the services of the workman was terminated

on 31st July, 1980. The workman has put in four months of service which is less than 240 days requiring him to bring his case under section 25(E) of the Industrial Disputes Act invalidating the order of termination for not issuing any notice or non payment of notice pay or compensation. The workman has been re-employed on 29th January, 1981 and the order of reference was made on 11th March, 1981. In fact it seems that the workman had no dispute at the time when the order of reference was made and it was after the receipt of the reference order that the workman became interested in claiming the wages for the period from 1st August, 1980 to 29th January 1981 to which he is not entitled as the termination cannot be held to be unjustified and not in order as per the term contained in his appointment letter Ex. W.W. 1/1. The workman is not entitled to any further relief. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Dated the 23rd September, 1981.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 3472, dated the 24th September, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Dispute Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

**No. 9(1)31-6Lab/12058.**—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s The Haryana Dairy Development Cooperative Federation Ltd., Milk Plant, Ambala City.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 17 of 1978

*between*

SHRI DEVINDER PAUL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S THE HARYANA  
DAIRY DEVELOPMENT COOPERATIVE FEDERATION LIMITED MILK PLANT,  
AMBALA CITY

*Present.—*

Shri Rajeswar Nath, for the workman.

Shri Janak Raj Sharma, for the management.

#### AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor, *vide* his order No. 1D/Amb/301-77/2728, dated 23rd January, 1978, under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Devinder Paul, workman and the management of M/s The Haryana Dairy Developmet Cooperative Federation Limited Milk Plant, Ambala City. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Devinder Paul was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared in response to the notices on 29th March, 1978, filed their respective pleadings. Issues were framed on the basis of their pleadings as under :

- (1) Whether the workman was an *ad hoc* appointee ? If so, to what effect ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified ?
- (3) If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The management examined Shri Jeet Singh Sahni, Establishment Assistant as their sole witness and closed their case. The workman examined himself as his witness and closed his case. I heard the learned representatives of the parties and have also gone through the record and the oral evidence decide issues as under : -

**Issue Nos. 1 to 3.**—The workman was appointed on *ad hoc* basis on six months against a temporary post which was likely to be made permanent as ward cashier,—*vide* letter Ex. M. 1. The workman submitted his joining report,—*vide* Ex. M-2. This shows that the appointment of the workman was initially on *ad hoc* basis. The service of the workman were terminated on 20th November, 1976,—*vide* Ex. M-4. The workman put in about three years service with the management. The management has not brought on record any order extending the services of the workman beyond six months of his date of appointment and he continued to be in the service of the management upto the date of termination i. e. 20th November, 1976 without any break. In the absence of any such letter treating him on *ad hoc* basis the workman shall be treated to have been confirmed on regular basis even though the management has not issued any such order confirming the workman. It has also been admitted by the management witness in his cross-examination that no dues were paid to the workman at the time of his termination. No charge-sheet was issued or enquiry held. The workman was not provided any opportunity of hearing. This shows that the management terminated the services of the workman abruptly and the words 'no longer required' appearing in the order of termination amounts to retrenchment and when no conditions laid down under section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act are fulfilled, the order of termination becomes illegal. The same is therefore, set aside. The workman is entitled to the reinstatement with continuity of service and with full back wages. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 26th September, 1981.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endst. No. 3502, dated the 26th September, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

The 9th November, 1981

No. 9(1)81-6-Lab.12356.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and management of M/s. Harbans Farm near Sikri, Tehsil Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 65 of 1981

*between*

SHRI RAM SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARBANS FARM  
NEAR SIKRI VILLAGE, TEHSIL BALLABGARH

*Present :*—

Workman in person.

None for the management.

### CORRIGENDUM AWARD

In the above-said reference award was sent,—*vide* this Tribunal letter No. 728 of 6th August, 1981. There arose a typographical mistake while writing the term of reference in the middle of the award. Hence “Whether the termination of services of Shri Ran Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?” be read in the end of first para and beginning of the second para.

Dated 30th September, 1981.

M.C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 906, dated the 1st October, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M.C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 16th November, 1981

**No. 9(1)81-6Lab/12560.**—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. (i) Ballarpur Industries Ltd., Unit Shree Gopal, Yamuna Nagar, (ii) Shri Chandraka Parshad and Bharat Nath Sons of Shri Ram Nath, Contractor Paper Mills, Yamuna Nagar :—

**BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK**

**Reference No. 164 of 78**

*between*

**SHRI RAJ NARAIN, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. (i) BALLARPUR INDUSTRIES LTD., UNIT SHREE GOPAL, YAMUNA NAGAR, (ii) SHRI CHANDRAKA PARSHAD AND BHARAT NATH SONS OF SHRI RAM NATH, CONTRACTOR, PAPER MILLS, YAMUNA NAGAR**

*Present.—*

Shri Inder Jain for the workman.

Shri W.C. Sharma for the management.

### AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/Amb/40-N-78/33529, dated 13th July, 1978 under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Raj Narain, workman and the management of M/s. Ballarpur Industries Ltd., Unit Shree Gopal, Yamuna Nagar, (ii) Shri Chandraka Parshad and Bharat Nath Sons of Shri Ram Nath, Contractor, Paper Mills, Yamuna Nagar. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raj Narain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference, notices as usual were sent to the parties. The parties appeared in response to the same, filed their respective pleadings and issues were framed on the basis of their pleadings. After several adjournment, parties arrived at an amicable settlement between themselves and the statements of the parties were recorded on 16th September, 1981 as under :—

**Statement of Shri Inder Jain, representative of the workman :—**

“The workman has settled his dispute with the management and has been reinstated. The workman does not want to pursue the matter any further. The award may be given accordingly.”

**Statement of Shri W. C. Sharma, representative of the management :**

"The statement given by the workman representative is admitted to be correct to the extent that the workman has been reinstated as casual worker with no back wages."

In view of their statements, no further adjudication is required. While answering the reference, I give my award that the workman has been reinstated as casual worker with no back wages.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Dated the 27th September, 1981.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 3508, dated 30th September, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

H. L. GUGNANI,

Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana,  
Labour and Employment Departments.

**DEVELOPMENT AND PANCHAYAT DEPARTMENT**

The 3rd December, 1981

No. E.B.-EI-81/56.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 4 and Section 5 of the Punjab Gram Panchayat Act, 1952 (Act 4 of 1953), and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana, hereby declares that village or group of villages specified in column 2 of the Schedule given below to the Sabha Area and establishes a Gram Panchayat for this Sabha by the name specified against in column 5 of the said Schedule, which shall consist of such number of Panches, including Sarpanch, as is specified against the Gram Panchayat in column 6 thereof out of which the number of panches belonging to the Scheduled Castes shall be mentioned in column 7 of the said Schedule :

**SCHEDULE**

| Serial<br>No. | Name(s) of<br>village(s) constituting<br>Sabha<br>Area | Tehsil | District | Name of Gram<br>Panchayat | No. of Panches<br>including<br>Sarpanch | No. of Panches<br>belonging<br>to Scheduled<br>Castes |
|---------------|--|--------|----------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 1             | 2  | 3      | 4        | 5                         | 6                                       | 7   |
| 203           | Mirpur ..  | Rewari | Narnaul  | Mirpur Panchli            | 7                                       | 2   |
| 203-A         | Janti ..   | Do     | Do       | Janti                     | 5                                       | 1   |
| 191           | Majra Gurdaspur ..                                     | Do     | Do       | Majra Gurdaspur           | 5                                       | 1   |
| 191-A         | Kaunsiwas ..   | Do     | Do       | Kaunsiwas<br>Boriwas      | 6                                       | 1   |
| 186           | Mandyā Kalan ..  | Do     | Do       | Mandyā Kalan<br>Dabri     | 5                                       | 1   |
| 186-A         | Kalaka ..  | Do     | Do       | Kalaka                    | 5                                       | 1   |